REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is filed in response to the Final Office Action of November 17, 2005 in which claims 1-10 and 13-30 were rejected. Applicants request reconsideration of the claims, as amended. The claims have been amended to address the Examiner's specific concern about claim 29 and the others to improve the readability. Withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejection of claim 29 is requested.

The Examiner has argued that claim 1 is obvious over a combination of Soliman and Bauchot. However, neither of these documents either teaches or suggests a frequency setting unit that receives signals from a first base station located in a first radio telecommunication network and uses these signals to adjust a frequency used by a second base station in a second radio telecommunications network.

Soliman discloses a method and apparatus for sequentially synchronizing timing and frequency generation in a communication network. This is achieved by means of a cascaded system in which a parent station communicates system time and frequency values to a child station, which in turn becomes a parent station by communicating that information to other stations. The parent and child stations are located in the same radio telecommunications network. Soliman therefore does not disclose a frequency setting unit that receives signals from a first base station located in a first radio telecommunication network and uses these signals to adjust a frequency used by a second base station in a second radio telecommunications network. This has been acknowledged by the Examiner, who has argued that the skilled person would find it obvious to combine the teachings of Soliman with those of Bauchot to obtain a frequency setting unit as claimed in claim 1, in which the first and second base stations are located in different radio telecommunications networks.

Bauchot discloses a method and an access point for transferring data between a synchronous network and an asynchronous network. The access point is responsible for scheduling traffic flow and for allocating bandwidth to traffic that is transmitted across the interface between the synchronous network and the

asynchronous network. Bauchot is not concerned with accurately setting frequencies between base stations.

The Examiner has argued that a person of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to add the teaching of Bauchot to that of Soliman so that one network is adjusted to cooperate with another network. Although the Examiner has not explicitly stated what motivation he believes the skilled person would have to perform such a combination, it appears that the argument may be based on a belief that the skilled person would be motivated to permit communication between two different networks. However, even if the skilled person did find it obvious to combine Soliman and Bauchot so as to communicate across two different networks, he still would not obtain the features of claim 1 from such a combination.

As explained above, Bauchot is not concerned with accurately setting frequencies between base stations. Therefore, if the skilled person were to combine Soliman and Bauchot, he would not find it obvious to modify Soliman's teachings regarding setting base station frequencies. If the skilled person were to combine Soliman and Bauchot with a view to permitting communication between different networks, he would simply implement a system in which the network of Soliman is additionally provided with an access point for transferring data between that network and another network. The skilled person would not implement a system in which the frequency used by a base station in one network is used to adjust the frequency of a base station in the other network, because there would be no reason for him to do so. Soliman teaches that the frequencies used by base stations within a network are adequately set by cascading time and frequency values through the base stations of that network. The skilled person would have no reason from either Soliman or Bauchot to modify that teaching by instead obtaining frequency information by means of signals received from another network (as discussed in more detail below). Therefore, it would not be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to make such a modification to the teachings of Soliman.

The present invention addresses the problem of synchronizing clocks across a network in which part of the transmission chain to a base station runs across an unclocked network (see e.g. page 2, paragraph 2). Neither Soliman nor Bauchot addresses or even considers this problem. Therefore, neither of these documents

would provide the person of ordinary skill in the art with any motivation to combine their teachings such that the frequency used by a base station in one network is adjusted in accordance with a frequency used in another network. It appears that the Examiner's argument is the product of hindsight reasoning, as it mosaics together features of Soliman and Bauchot to form a combination of features that would not have been obvious to the skilled person without prior knowledge of the invention.

Thus, neither Soliman nor Bauchot either teaches or suggests a frequency setting unit such as that claimed in claim 1, in which: a radio receiver of the unit receives signals from a first base station transmitting signals at a first frequency and located in a first radio telecommunications network; an analysis apparatus of the unit analyses the received signals to determine the first frequency; and a frequency setting apparatus coupled to a second base station transmitting signals at a second frequency and located in a second radio telecommunications network, adjust the second frequency with the aim of establishing a desired relationship between the second frequency and the first frequency. Therefore, claim 1 is new and non-obvious over Soliman and Bauchot and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection thereof is requested.

Regarding claims 2-5, 7-8, 10, 14-17, and 28-29, the same reasoning applies as discussed above and withdrawal of the rejection thereof on the same ground is requested.

Regarding the rejection of dependent claims 6 and 9, these depend either directly (claim 9) or indirectly (claim 6) from claim 1 and are nonobviously patentable for at least the reasons discussed above and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection thereof is requested.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of claim 13 it depends from claim 1 and is nonobvious for at least the reasons given above and withdrawal of the rejection thereof on that ground is requested.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of claims 18 and 26 these are dependent from claims 1 and 24, respectively, and are at least patentable for the reasons advance above. Withdrawal of the rejection thereof is requested.

Regarding the obviousness rejection of claims 19-20, claim 19 depends from claim 1 and is at least patentable for the reasons discussed above in connection with

the nonobviousness of claim 1 and withdrawal of the rejection thereof on that ground is requested. Claim 20 is an independent claim that is nonobvious for the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1 and withdrawal of the rejection thereof is requested.

Claim 21 depends from claim 20 and is nonobvious for at least the reasons given above in connection with the discussion of claim 20 and withdrawal of the rejection thereof is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of November 17, 2005, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-14 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/mo
Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 261-1234